

Exhibit B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

* * * * *
STUDENTS FOR FAIR *
ADMISSIONS, INC., *
Plaintiff, *
*
vs. *
*
PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF *
HARVARD COLLEGE, et al, *
Defendants. *
* * * * *

CIVIL ACTION
No. 14-14176-ADB

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALLISON D. BURROUGHS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
STATUS CONFERENCE

A P P E A R A N C E S

CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PARK PLLC
Ten Post Office Square, 8th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
for the plaintiff
By: Patrick Strawbridge, Esq.

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE and DORR LLP (Bos)
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
for the defendants
By: Felicia H. Ellsworth, Esq.

Courtroom No. 17
Robing Room
John J. Moakley Courthouse
1 Courthouse Way
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
September 6, 2016
9:30 a.m.

1 So going backwards it is, it's not just the push of
2 a button but it is a similar format. Some of the fields
3 won't exist in earlier years, right. Some things were
4 added. Some field names might change but it is easier to go
5 backwards than forward from the administrative --

6 **THE COURT:** So how about this as a compromise.
7 I give you the eight years but only make them go
8 backwards --

9 **MR. STRAWBRIDGE:** That's fine with us. I
10 suppose, I think Harvard had more of an interest in having a
11 more recent year but I think we view pre-employment (ph.)
12 years as more probative anyway.

13 **MS. ELLSWORTH:** We're certainly happy to go
14 backwards. We still think eight is too many and we suggest
15 maybe doing individualized data fields for whatever number
16 of years you might honor and then some -- that you order,
17 excuse me, and some aggregate data back, further back, back
18 eight years. I'm not sure why we need a line item for
19 each --

20 **THE COURT:** I'm definitely going back to six
21 because *Fisher* says three isn't enough and, so it's not
22 going to be, it's going to be between six and eight but what
23 about that six years going backwards with the aggregate data
24 for the seventh and eighth years?

25 **MR. STRAWBRIDGE:** Obviously we prefer eight

1 but six years going backwards is certainly a good start. I
2 guess --

3 **THE COURT:** All right. Let's do this. Six
4 years going backwards, aggregate data for seven and eight.
5 If there is anything in the aggregate data that looks
6 anomalous to you, you can raise it and we'll see about
7 digging deeper into that, okay.

8 **MR. STRAWBRIDGE:** Okay. So just to make sure
9 I understand, we're talking about the six years prior to the
10 years that they've already produced?

11 **THE COURT:** They produced the two most recent
12 years, right?

13 **MR. STRAWBRIDGE:** Right.

14 **THE COURT:** So six years prior, so four years
15 complete data prior and then two years of aggregate data.

16 **MR. STRAWBRIDGE:** Okay.

17 **MS. ELLSWORTH:** So we're producing four more
18 years going backwards?

19 **THE COURT:** Yes.

20 **MS. ELLSWORTH:** And then for aggregate data --

21 **THE COURT:** So you guys can sort out aggregate
22 data. And if it ends up being easier for you to produce all
23 six years in the same way, that's fine too. But I do have
24 concerns about, you know, there is a view, even a view in my
25 chambers that, you know, two complete four-year cycles is